UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,837	08/27/2003	Jason Edward Gibson	200309117-1	7413

22879 7590 03/10/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
PARK, CHAN S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2625	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/650,837	GIBSON, JASON EDWARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHAN S. PARK	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 December 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Chan S. Park

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 12/7/07, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1-45** are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 10, filed 12/7/07, with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 of claims 44 and 45 have been withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments, see pages 10-11, filed 12/7/07, with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd of claims 3 and 31 have been withdrawn.

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/7/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument regarding the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimoosawa, the applicant states that Shimoosawa fails to teach the method for modifying printing device settings based on the identity of "a client submitting said print job". Particularly, with regard to claim 1, the applicant points out that Shimoosawa rather teaches "transfer attributes" for an email that are based on the email's "destination address". The examiner disagrees.

Shimoosawa teaches:

> Next, a transfer determination unit matches the obtained sender ID and a content of a sender ID column of a transfer management table. When a match is found, the transfer determination unit reads a content of a transfer destination ID column corresponding to the sender ID column in the transfer management table and a content of a transfer attribute column. An appended file portion is deleted from the electric mail in accordance with the content of the read transfer attribute column, "deletion process." Thereafter, the electric mail from which the appended file portion is deleted is transferred to a transfer destination registered in the read transfer destination ID column. (Abstract)
>
> A header analyzing unit 32 analyzes a header portion of the received e-mail, thereby obtaining a sender mail address (hereinafter referred to as a sender ID). A transfer determination unit 33 determines whether or not transfer is needed based on the sender ID obtained by the header analyzing unit 32. When the transfer is needed, a process to be provided is decided to adjust to the performance and the circumstance of the apparatus used in the transfer destination.
> The above determination and decision are carried out in accordance with a transfer management table 34. (col. 4, lines 57-67)

It is clear from the cited portions that the facsimile apparatus of fig. 3 (which is construed as the printing device) dynamically modifies its settings to be either the transfer setting or non-transfer setting based on the sender ID. The transfer destination address is simply used to transfer the email/facsimile when it is determined that the transfer is needed based on the sender ID.

The applicant repeatedly cited the statement from MPEP § 2131 that "[a] claim is anticipated [under 35 U.S.C. § 102] only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference". Since every element as set forth in the claims is found, the previously rejections must be maintained in accordance with MPEP § 2131.

With regard to claim 18, the applicant states that Shimoosawa fails to teach the claimed printing device that "extracts an identifier from said print job and adjusts printing device configuration settings based on said identifier". Again, the examiner disagrees. Since the header portion of the received e-mail is analyzed by the header analyzing unit 32, this sender address (the header portion) must be extracted and obtained. Furthermore, it is clear from the cited portions that the facsimile apparatus of fig. 3 (which is construed as the printing device) dynamically modifies its settings to be either the transfer setting or non-transfer setting based on the sender ID. The transfer destination address is simply used to transfer the email/facsimile when it is determined that the transfer is needed based on the sender ID.

With regard to claim 44, the applicant states that Shimoosawa fails to teach the instructions causing a printing device to "scan a print job for an identifier". Again, the examiner disagrees. As demonstrated above, Shimoosawa scans the header portions to analyze the sender ID.

With regard to claim 2, the applicant states that Shimoosawa fails to teach the method of "querying a database to obtain settings for said printing device". Again, the examiner disagrees. Shimoosawa teaches that the determination and decision for setting the facsimile apparatus to a transfer setting are carried out in accordance with a transfer management table shown in fig. 4 (col. 4, lines 66-67).

With regard to claim 16, the applicant states that Shimoosawa fails to teach the method of "determining a group to which said printing device belongs based on said identifier". According to the Specification of the current invention (paragraph 23 of U.S. Patent Pub No. 2005/0046875), the group which the sender belongs is determined to modify the settings of the printing device. The examiner notes that the facsimile apparatus of Shimoosawa teaches such a method. Referring to the table shown in fig. 4, the Sender ID column lists several email addresses and the apparatus setting is modified according to the sender ID column. For example, when the analyzed sender's email address indicates "xxxxx@rdng.or.jp" or "zzzzz@rdng.or.jp", the sender belongs to a group "*@rdng.or.jp" in which the apparatus is set to transfer the data over the network. However, when the sender's email address indicates "xxxxx@abc.or.jp" or "zzzzz@abc.or.jp", the sender belongs to a group "*@abc.or.jp" in which the apparatus is set to not transfer the data over the network. Therefore, based only on the domain address of the sender's email, it determines a group to which the sender belongs. The examiner respectfully requests the applicant to clearly point out from the Specification how this determination claimed in claim 16 differs from the teaching of Shimoosawa because the difference is not apparent in the current claim wording.

With regard to claim 20, the applicant states that Shimoosawa fails to disclose a database that associates "printing device locations with printing device configuration settings". The examiner disagrees. First, the examiner notes that the claimed "printing device locations" are construed as the destination printing device locations and the

claimed "printing device configuration settings" are construed as the printing device configuration settings of the printing device recited in claim 18, not the destination printing devices. As demonstrated in the previous Office Action filed on 9/7/07 wherein on pages 7 and 8, Shimoosawa discloses the printing device comprising a database associates with the printing device configuration settings (fig. 4 & col. 4, lines 57-67). Shimoosawa, however, does not explicitly disclose a database associating with printing/client device locations (it is noted that the printing device is also construed as the client device since the client at the printing device receives the data). Sims, the same field of endeavor of the facsimile art, discloses a data management computer having a database for storing fax numbers with its associated locations (col. 16, lines 25-32). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the database of Shimoosawa to include the fax numbers with its associated locations as taught by Sims. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with information regarding the physical location of the destination of the print job. The examiner respectfully requests the applicant to clearly point out from the Specification how the database associating the printing device locations claimed in claim 18 differs from the teaching of Shimoosawa because the difference is not apparent in the current claim wording.

With regard to claim 36, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 20, are applicable.

Since none of the arguments presented by the applicant is persuasive, the rejections of claims 1-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) & 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are maintained and repeated in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-7, 9, 16-19, 21, 24-26, 28-35, 37 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimoosawa.

With respect to claim 1, Shimoosawa teaches a method of configuring a printing device (fig. 1 & abstract), said method comprising:

dynamically modifying printing device settings based on an identifier in an incoming job identifying a client submitting said print job (col. 4, lines 57-67; col. 5, lines 13-52; & col. 11, lines 16-50). Also, refer to the Response to Arguments presented above.

With respect to claim 2, Shimoosawa teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

scanning data packets of said print job for said identifier (col. 4, lines 57-59);

querying a database (storage storing the table in fig. 4) to obtain settings for said printing device associated with said identifier (col. 5, lines 20-37); and

configuring said printing device according to said settings associated with said identifier (figs. 8~10 & col. 11, lines 16-50).

With respect to claim 3, Shimoosawa teaches the method of claim 2, wherein said querying a database comprises:

determining a location associated with said identifier (col. 3, lines 61-67); and

retrieving settings for said printing device associated with said location (col. 3, lines 61-67). It is inherent that the proper storage and location are determined first in order to retrieve the transfer attribute 53 in fig. 4. Also, note that each sender ID is associated with each transfer attribute stored in the respective storage location.

With respect to claim 4, Shimoosawa teaches the method of claim 2, wherein said configuring said printing device occurs automatically when said print job is received (col. 11, lines 33-42).

With respect to claim 5, Shimoosawa teaches the method of claim 2, wherein said scanning comprises searching header data for said identifier (col. 4, lines 57-59).

With respect to claim 6, Shimoosawa teaches the method of claim 2, further comprising storing said identifier in printing device memory (note that the email address must be stored first, either permanently or temporarily in order to be compared with sender ID in fig. 4). Also, refer to the Response to Arguments presented above.

With respect to claim 7, Shimoosawa teaches the method of claim 2, wherein said database is organized such that each identifier is associated with a set of printing device settings (fig. 4).

With respect to claim 9, Shimoosawa teaches the method of claim 2, wherein said database is stored in printing device memory (col. 3, line 61 – col. 4, line 2 & col. 12, lines 23-31).

With respect to claim 16, Shimoosawa teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising determining a group to which said printing device belongs based on said identifier (a group belongs to *@rdmg.mgcs.or.jp in col. 5, lines 20-28).

With respect to claim 17, Shimoosawa teaches the method of claim 16, further comprising configuring said printing device according to setting specified for members of said group (col. 5, lines 20-28).

With respect to claim 18, Shimoosawa discloses a printing device comprising:

an input for receiving a print job (col. 5, lines 20-52); and

a print engine configured to produce a hardcopy from said print job (col. 11, lines 16-50);

wherein said printing device extracts an identifier from said print job and adjusts printing device configuration settings based on said identifier (col. 5, lines 13-52 & col. 11, lines 16-50). Also, refer to the Response to Arguments presented above.

With respect to claim 19, Shimoosawa discloses the printing device of claim 18, further comprising a database associating identifiers with printing device configuration settings (figs. 4 & 8~10; col. 11, lines 16-50).

With respect to claim 21, Shimoosawa discloses the printing device of claim 19, wherein said database is stored in a memory unit of said printing device (note that the email address must be stored first, either permanently or temporarily in order to be compared with sender ID in fig. 4).

With respect to claim 24, Shimoosawa discloses the printing device of claim 18, further comprising a programmable controller programmed to scan data packet headers for said identifier (col. 4, lines 57-69).

With respect to claim 25, Shimoosawa discloses the printing device of claim 20, wherein said programmable controller is programmed to query a database to obtain identification information (transfer ID 52 in fig. 4) associated with said identifier.

With respect to claim 26, Shimoosawa discloses the printing device of claim 20, wherein said programmable controller is programmed to determine the source location of said data packet based on said identification information (the email address gives who the sender is).

With respect to claim 28, Shimoosawa discloses the printing device of claim 18, further comprising a user interface (fig. 1).

With respect to claims 29-35, 37, 42 and 43, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1-7, 9, 16 and 17 respectively, are applicable.

With respect to claim 44, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 2, are applicable. Also, refer to the Response to Arguments presented above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 8, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimoosawa as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Sims et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,434,775 (hereinafter Sims).

With respect to claim 8, Shimoosawa discloses the printing device of claim 2, wherein said database is organized such that each identifier is associated with a set of printing device settings (fig. 4).

Shimoosawa, however, does not explicitly disclose that each identifier is associated with a client location.

Sims, the same field of endeavor of the facsimile art, discloses a data management computer having a database for storing fax number with its associated location (col. 16, lines 25-32).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the database of Sims into the printing system of Shimoosawa.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with information regarding the physical location of the destination of the print job.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shimoosawa with Sims to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

With respect to claim 13, the combination teaches the method of claim 8, wherein said database comprises a physical location corresponding to each identifier (col. 16, lines 25-32 of Sims).

With respect to claim 14, the combination teaches the method of claim 13, wherein said physical location comprises a room number or floor number (col. 16, lines 25-32 of Sims).

7. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimoosawa as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Sims.

With respect to claim 20, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 2 and 8, are applicable. Also, refer to the Response to Arguments presented above.

8. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimoosawa as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Sims.

With respect to claim 36, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 8, are applicable. Also, refer to the Response to Arguments presented above.

9. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimoosawa as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Sims.

With respect to claim 45, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 2 and 8, are applicable.

10. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimoosawa as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Shima U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0098471.

With respect to claims 10 and 11, Shimoosawa teaches the method of claim 2, but it does not explicitly teach whether said database is stored on a network server or Internet server.

Shima, the same field of endeavor of setting the printing device based on the setting parameter stored in the database, teaches the method of printing parameters in a database stored in a network/Internet server (paragraphs 70-75 & 86)..

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the server database for storing the printer parameters into the printing system of Shimoosawa.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the cost of internal memory and further provide the printing device with most updated printing device settings associated with the identifier.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shimoosawa with Shima to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10 and 11.

11. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimoosawa as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Shima.

With respect to claims 22 and 23, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 10 and 11, are applicable.

12. Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimoosawa as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Shima.

With respect to claims 38 and 39, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 10 and 11, are applicable.

13. Claims 12 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimoosawa.

With respect to claim 12, Shimoosawa teaches the method of 2, further comprising changing the content of the transfer management table 34 by the user.

Shimoosawa, however, does not explicitly teach the method of requiring authentication to access said database.

The examiner takes an Official Notice that the requiring authentication to access and modify the content of said database is well known in the network security field. One would have been motivated to implement this requiring step to ensure the proper transmission of the print job via the printing device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

With respect to claim 40, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 12, are applicable.

14. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimoosawa as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Nakaoka et al. U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0201860.

With respect to claim 15, Shimoosawa teaches the method of claim 1, but it does not explicitly teach that said identifier comprises an IP address.

Nakaoka, the same field of endeavor of recognizing the print job sender, teaches the method of identifying the sender by analyzing the IP address (paragraph 80).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the method of identifying the sender by analyzing the IP address into the printing system of Shimoosawa.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the capability of changing the printing device setting based on the IP address.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shimoosawa with Nakaoka to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

15. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimoosawa as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Nakaoka.

With respect to claim 41, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 15, are applicable.

16. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimoosawa as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Venkatranman et al. U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0025307 (hereinafter Venkatranman).

With respect to claim 27, Shimoosawa discloses the printing device of claim 18, but it does not explicitly disclose that the printing device comprises an embedded web server.

Venkatranman, the same field of endeavor of the network printing/facsimile device, discloses a printing device having an embedded web server for providing a user with the printing device information on a webpage (fig. 1B & paragraph 27).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the web server of Venkatranman into the printing device of Shimoosawa.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the printing device information to a user on the network.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shimoosawa with Venkatranman to obtain the invention as specified in claim 27.

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S. PARK whose telephone number is (571)272-7409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Chan S. Park
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

csp
February 28, 2008

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER